

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 28-86 were pending of which claims 33-86 were withdrawn. Claims 28-32 were rejected. In this response, claims 33-86 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 28-32 have been amended. In addition, new claims 87-133 have been added. Thus, claims 28-32 and 87-133 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claims 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,321,522 of Eschbach ("Eschbach"). In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 28-32 and 87-133 include limitations that are not disclosed in Eschbach. Specifically, independent claim 28 as amended recites as follows:

28. A method for processing encoded data, said method comprising:  
receiving an indication of an amount of data used to encode importance levels over a plurality of tiles, the indication embedded in the encoded data;  
determining a predetermined amount of the encoded data to decode based on the amount of data used to encode the importance levels in order to maintain substantially identical fidelity over the plurality of tiles; and  
decoding only the predetermined amount of the encoded data over the plurality of tiles.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 28 as amended includes receiving an indication embedded within the encoded data for indicating an amount of data used to encode the importance levels over multiple tiles, using the indication to determine an amount of encoded data that needs to be decoded to maintain substantially the same fidelity over the multiple tiles, and decoding only those determined amount of encoded data over the multiple tiles. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from Eschbach.

Although Eschbach discloses an EQDCT counter 52, such a counter is used to receive a "BLOCK ON" signal for indicating the receipt of a block of encoded, quantized coefficient data, where the counter is incremented for each bit of data received (see col. 5, lines 33 to 46 of Eschbach). There is no disclosure within Eschbach that an indication is received within the encoded data for indicating an amount of data encoded. Further, Eschbach fails to disclose determining the predetermined amount of data to be decoded based on the indication in order to maintain substantially the same fidelity (e.g., quality) over multiple tiles for each of the importance level.

In order to anticipate a claim, each and every limitations of the claim must be taught by the cited references. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from Eschbach. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 28 is not anticipated by Eschbach.

Similarly, independent claims 30, 32, and 133 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 28. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, independent claims 30, 32, and 133 are not anticipated by Eschbach.

Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, at least for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are not anticipated by Eschbach. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: May 9, 2005

  
Kevin G. Shao  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 45,095  
Kevin\_Shao@bstz.com

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300